

MARION ROAD TRUNK SANITARY SEWER PROJECT ALTERNATIVE URBAN AREAWIDE REVIEW

AGENCY AND TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FIELD REVIEW

Date/Time: Wednesday, August 29, 2001
1:30 to 4:30 p.m.

Location: National Guard Armory
(1715 Marion Road SE)

Attendees: TAC: Joellen Rumley (MPCA), Skip Langer (SWCD), Richard Freese (Rochester Public Works), Don Nelson (DNR), Dave Senjem (Rochester City Council), Lee Ganske (CUDE), Chuck Michael (Olmsted County Environmental Commission), Jim Baier (Marion Town Board), Tim Swanson (Marion Township resident), Ed Scherr (Marion Township resident), Jim Mosser (Marion Township resident); Charlie Reiter (Planning Department)

Others: Barb Huberty (RPW), Jim Loehr (RPW), Leslie Knapp (Earth Tech), Mark Rothfork (Earth Tech), Trudy Richter (Richardson-Richter), Dave Raby (HR Green), Kevin Pape (HR Green), Lil Leatham (HKGi), Brad Scheib (HKGi), Jon Larsen (EQB), Dallas Backhaus (resident)

MEETING AGENDA

1.0 Welcome, Introductions, TAC Book

Barb Huberty (City of Rochester) welcomed attendees, introductions were made, and the contents of the TAC notebooks were reviewed.

2.0 Purposes of Field Review

Leslie Knapp (Earth Tech, Inc.) reviewed the purposes of the field review:

- Introduce TAC members and Agency staff to the project
- Familiarize participants with the project area
- Initiate the input process (referenced Tour Worksheet)
- Identify regulatory issues, environmental constraints, and other pertinent information
- Identify key Agency contacts

3.0 Purpose of TAC

Trudy Richter (Richardson Richter Associates, Inc.) reviewed the purpose of the TAC as outlined in the “Purpose of the Technical Advisory Committee” handout.

4.0 AUAR Background

Barb Huberty presented an overview of the background of the Marion AUAR and the AUAR process as presented in the Fact Sheet.

5.0 Project Status

Leslie Knapp reviewed the project task list with attendees. The project schedule is being refined and will be distributed at the next meeting. Brad Scheib (Hoisington Koegler Group, Inc.) and Leslie Knapp provided an overview of the constraint mapping. Available information in compiled on the maps to help guide planning in the area. Much of the information on the maps represents inventoried information and does not necessarily represent a constraint.

5.0 Discuss Field Review Route

Barb Huberty reviewed the proposed field review route and stops. She also asked if any of the attendees wanted to add any stops. No additional stops were suggested. TAC, agency staff, and other attendees boarded the tour bus.

7.0 Conduct Field Review

The field review was conducted. TAC, agency representatives, and other attendees were encouraged to fill out the Field Review Worksheet to give it to Barb Huberty at the end of the review or within the next three days.

8.0 Recap of Tour Worksheets in the Armory

Trudy Richter led a group discussion on Tour Worksheet notes. She also helped the group identify key observations, new or additional information, and next steps.

- 1) What type of development is assumed, residential or commercial? It appears that most of the area will be residential. Has any thought been given to industrial development and whether it would be wet or dry industry? Barb Huberty indicated that the land use map identified the existing and planned usage in the area and agreed that most of the area outside of the Marion Road corridor is identified as residential. A general observation was made that the area has a lot of topographic change, which can occur abruptly. Richard Freese (City of Rochester, TAC) explained that commercial and industrial sites have maximum slope requirements and the topography of the area limits the area suitable for commercial or industrial usage.

- 2) Is there any consideration of commercial development in the area? Old 52/Marion Road with businesses have 200-300 people. Barb Huberty said that the consultant that completed the trunk sewer design considered the commercial and industrial areas along Marion Road. Richard Freese stated that residential wastewater generation is about 100 gallons per occupant per day compared to a dry industry where the generation may be only 20 gallons per occupant per day, but that there may be more produced in a commercial building depending on the occupancy. The residential generation overall is higher and it would be conservative from a wastewater generation standpoint to assume primarily residential development, which is what we are doing. If a wet industry is considered, a higher level of wastewater generation will result. As Barb Huberty said, the project boundaries are driven by wastewater system capacity that is, in turn, driven by the density of development and development scenarios. If the development scenario is higher than an average of 2.5 units per acre, the project boundaries will likely need to be adjusted inward due to the capacity of the trunk sewer.
- 3) Barb Huberty stated that as part of the environmental review rules, the City Council must approve an Order for Review. The resolution will include adoption of a development scenario for evaluation in the AUAR and a project boundary. The City wants to get as much preliminary work done as possible before taking the Order for Review to the City Council and the clock starts ticking on completing the AUAR. The AUAR will likely evaluate a worst case scenario (highest level of development impacts anticipated), not because we anticipate all future development will reflect this level, but to make sure that future development will fall at or below this level of impact and will be covered by the AUAR. If a future development exceeds the AUAR development scenario, it may need to complete an independent EAW.
- 4) How will jurisdiction over the area work was raised as an issue. Why should the City be determining development for the Town? Richard Freese referenced the Urban Service Area limits and City as the Responsible Governmental Unit (RGU) for the AUAR. One key concept is that the development scenario will follow existing approved plans for the area. The goal will be to maximize the flexibility within the development scenario. The development scenario will dictate the boundaries of the project area. Jon Larson (Environmental Quality Board) indicated that the environmental review process is an information gathering process. No additional requirements or authority results from the process. The environmental review process should guide the permitting process. The AUAR is used to study connected and cumulative impacts. It is not a controlling or regulatory document. It provides information in a comprehensive way that hopefully will evaluate impacts in a cumulative way. Other projects within the area may need environmental review if they are not consistent with the AUAR. However, the AUAR will expedite the process for environmental review in the future. No new regulatory requirements should result from the AUAR. The AUAR assessment is not regulatory, but preparation of a Mitigation Plan is required as part of the AUAR process and it must be an enforceable document.
- 5) Barb Huberty referred to the fact that environmental features such as watersheds and air don't recognize political or jurisdictional boundaries and that the AUAR will provide a method of evaluating environmental impacts that considers the overall area rather than on a

development by development basis. Richard Freese said that the EAWs conducted on a development by development basis almost always checked the connected action box as “no”. Some environmental resources may not have been adequately addressed using this method. He referenced the key words used by Jon Larson as CONNECTED AND CUMULATIVE. This level of evaluation may have been missed when individual parcels were developed. Need to be in compliance with the big picture.

- 6) Don Nelson (Department of Natural Resources, TAC) said that this is a large area and provides a chance to look at natural resources, riparian corridors. He is interested in how this will work out. A lot of development had already been conducted in the area and it will be a challenge to intersperse new development. The connectivity of natural resources including those along Badger Run and Bear Creek will be important considerations. Jim Mosser (resident, TAC) thought that a lot of area is already developed and it seems like in addition to protecting environmental features, we need to consider restoring some environmental features in some areas that have already been disturbed. The existing scattered development poses a challenge as one attempts to maintain connectedness of natural corridors.
- 7) Roads need to be looked at carefully and need to be addressed as part of the AUAR process. There are some real problems out there. The Township has formed a safety committee and they are going to meet with MN DOT to discuss making improvements the area. People can’t get out onto the roads. The AUAR will need to discuss how to the future development impact on the roads.
- 8) A reference was made to the fact that it is unusual to see the City and Township sitting next to each other at a meeting.

9.0 Set Next TAC Meeting Date

The next TAC meeting to review constraint mapping and development scenarios is set for Tuesday, September 25 from 1:30 PM-4:30 PM; location to be announced.

10.0 Key Information Shared at Various Times during the Day

- 1) An issue related to economic constraints on the project area and its development was raised with the assumption that another sales tax would have to be put in place to handle future sewage management needs. The answer provided was that the limiting factor for the area to be studied is the pipe capacity only and that this is dependent upon development scenarios.
- 2) Some prairie remnants in areas under development were pointed out. A TAC member raised the concern that there should be a plan for preserving green spaces beyond just parks.
- 3) There was a question on mound septic system design and State standards (minimum requirement of three foot separation from top of bedrock) were referenced as well as the more stringent (minimum requirement of four foot separation from top of bedrock) adopted by Olmsted County.

- 4) At Stop 8-Arlington Lane Cul de Sac, Jim Moser described an area of seeps and wetlands in the area that flowed until the end of July. He also provided information regarding the unpredictability of wet basements in the area. His basement is dry, but a house in a slight dip on the other end of the development has a wet basement.
- 5) It was stated and confirmed by the EQB that once the AUAR and Mitigation Plan are adopted, it will apply to any new development within the project area. The AUAR will be updated every five years. If a developer wants to deviate from the development scenario adopted in the AUAR, other environmental review such as an EAW may be required.
- 6) A question was asked about the timing of obtaining permits for a sewer extension before obtaining easements from property owners and how long permits are valid. Jim Loehr (City of Rochester) and MPCA staff indicated that the permits do not have an expiration date. The City can typically complete easement or purchase agreements, or as a last resort, condemn land to install the sewer independently from the permitting process.
- 7) At Location 17, it was asked if there was natural slope of the valley along Bear Creek to allow for gravity flow in any sewer line to County Road 19 and beyond. Jim Loehr said that was correct and that gravity flow could be handled all the way to Chester.

H:\AUAR\FieldReviewNotes.doc

9/7/01